The United Nations Seems to Be Celebrating International Hypocrisy Week, See Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 43 NOVEMBER 12, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Is This Bulganin's Notion of Responsibility?

In his message to Eisenhower, Premier Bulganin said the Soviet Union and the U.S. as "the two great powers which possess all modern types of arms, including the atomic and hydrogen weapons . . . bear particular responsibility for stopping war and reestablishing peace and calm." The Soviet Premier displayed a strange conception of that responsibility in the tone and content of the message he sent next day to Prime Minister Eden. In demanding that England withdraw its troops from Egypt, Bulganin warned "there are countries now which need not have sent a navy or air force to the coast of Britain but could have used other means, such as rocket techniques. If rocket weapons had been used against Britain and France," he continued, making the implied threat plainer, "they would probably have called this a barbarous action." Bulganin's conclusion was couched in the language of a superior addressing an inferior. "We are fully determined to crush the aggressors," Bulganin declared, "and restore peace in the East, through the use of force. We hope at this critical moment you will display due prudence and draw the corresponding conclusions from this." This is the phrasing of an ultimatum, not an appeal for peace.

Bulganin's words must have recalled to Englishmen, may have been intended to recall, Khrushchev's speech at the Birmingham trade fair during his visit to England with Bulganin last April. At that time Khrushchev boasted, "It is a fact that the Soviet Union was the first to explode a hydrogen bomb from an aeroplane. . . . I am quite sure that we will have the guided missile with an H-bomb warhead which can land anywhere in the world." Though Bulganin did not speak of *nuclear* rockets in his letter to Eden, he could hardly have been surprised that the British press at once saw in this a threat of long distance bombardment by nuclear missiles. This is unexpected from the Power which has been campaigning since the Stockholm Appeal for a ban on the use of nuclear weapons. Does Bulganin think he serves the cause of peace by talking so quickly and lightly of measures which would unleash a world nuclear war? Does he think Russia could bomb Britain without provoking retaliation from America? It is easy to imagine the outcry if Eisenhower, in a message of similar tone, had threatened to bomb Russia unless its troops evacuated Hungary. The U.S. would be accused of rattling the atomic saber, and of seeking to dictate by terror. It is Bulganin, not Eisenhower, who fails in the awful responsibility entailed by possession of the new weapons. The first element of that responsibility is restraint. The Missile is not an instrument of guided diplomacy.

Even in Victory, The GOP Still Proves to Be A Minority Party

Eisenhower's victory was a foregone conclusion, but the dimensions were a surprise. They show that despite Ike's overwhelming popularity, the GOP remains a minority party. This was the first time since Wilson's reelection in 1916 that a victoriously reelected President failed to carry the House with him. The country split its ticket, and split it wisely. The combination of Eisenhower and a Democratic Congress is not a bad one in a crisis. If Clements is defeated in Kentucky, Lausche will not be doing Eisenhower a favor to leave him at the mercy of a Republican Senate.

The Democrats may end by being thankful that they did not win this election. Painful adjustments lie ahead even if, when and as the current war crisis is resolved. Can the boom go on forever? There will have to be recognition of Communist China and a modus vivendi with the Soviet Union. Eisenhower can get the country to swallow these bitter pills far more easily than Stevenson could; the Democrats will be less warlike and more sensible backstopping Eisenhower than they would have been on their own.

Stevenson had an impossible task. Thanks in large part to the reforms of the New Deal and their acceptance by the Republicans, the country has been enjoying extraordinary prosperity and social stability. The war scare plus contentment plus a Negro revolt (as in Virginia) against the Democrats gave Ike all but Missouri and the deepest of the deep Southern States.

It is a pleasure to see the election to the Senate of Javits, John Sherman Cooper, and former Mayor Clark of Philadelphia; to have Morse returned by Oregon and Wiley by Wisconsin; to see Welker defeated by Church in Idaho. They help to counterbalance the victor of Capehart in Indiana, the reappearance of Revercomb from West Virginia and the debut of Talmadge from Georgia. One unfavorable result of the election will be to weaken Reuther as against Meany in the labor movement. When the UAW failed to carry Michigan for Stevenson, despite "Soapy" Williams reelection as Governor, it was a blow to those who wanted labor to take a more militant part in politics.

Why Not Replace Dulles With George?

In view of the Democratic majority in the new Congress, the gravity of the international situation, and the serious illness of John Foster Dulles, we believe former Senator George would make an ideal successor as Secretary of State. No man has had more experience of foreign affairs or has more prestige in Congress. He is closer to Eisenhower's position on peace than Dulles. George helped bring about the summit meeting. A new one may soon be necessary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among The Directors of Leading U. S. Corporations Almost All Gave to The GOP

In The World of The Big Money, Democrats Are Few And Far Between

The report on campaign contributions made public last week by a Senate Privileges and Elections subcommittee shows how lopsidedly big business and high finance in this country favor the Republicans. One of the voluminous exhibits released with this report gives the contributions of $500 or more made by officers of our 225 largest corporations. This reveals that while they gave $1,031,067 to the Republicans this year, they gave only $38,100 to the Democrats. Since reported contributions make up a minor portion of total campaign expenditures, this understates the extent to which moneyed men prefer the GOP.*

In the oil industry, of 54 oil company officials or directors who reported contributions of $500 or more, only two contributed to the Democrats: Jacob Blaustein (Amoco) of Baltimore gave $5,000 and C. Jared Ingersoll (Atlantic Refining) of Philadelphia gave $500. Again, among the directors of the 25 largest commercial banks who contributed $344,356 to the Republican party, only two were shown as contributors to the Democrats. One was the same C. Jared Ingersoll (as a director of New York's Hanover Bank) and the other, Marshall Field, one time backer of PM, who is a director of Chicago's First National. (See box this page).

Only One Utility Man

Of the 25 largest utilities in the country, only one director, Harry Wall, Lewiston, Idaho, of Consumers Power, lists a contribution to the Democrats. He gave $500. The 25 largest insurance companies show only three contributors to the Democrats: John M. Budd, St. Paul (New York Life), $1,000; R. E. Gross, of Burbank, Cal. (Penn Mutual), $500 and Dr. Robert L. Johnson of Philadelphia, Pa. (Penn Mutual), $1,000.

The nation's 25 largest transportation companies are equally denuded of Democrats. They show only three directors contributed to the Democrats and one is the same C. Jared Ingersoll of Philadelphia, who reappears here as a director of Pennsylvania Railroad. The other two mavericks are Solon B. Turman of New Orleans, a director of Illinois Central ($500), and James McCahey of Chicago, a director of the Nickel Plate ($1,000).

Even in merchandising, the 25 largest corporations show very few Democratic contributors. Kroger's lists one Democrat, Warren E. Carter of Akron, who gave $2,000; Sears Roebuck has one Democrat, Edgar B. Stern of New Orleans, who gave $1,000; and the Davis family, of Florida, which controls the Winn Dixie stores, gave the Democrats $4,000.

Among the wealthy families of the country, almost all are Republican. The Rockefellers gave the G.O.P. $100,500; the Mellons, $99,150; the du Ponts, $88,300; the Pews, $46,000. The Vanderbilts gave the Republicans $33,800 and the Democrats $5,000. The largest contribution to the Democrats from a family group came from the Reynolds family, of Reynolds Metals, which owes its rise to New Deal anti-trust action against Alcoa. They contributed $41,250 to the Democrats. The Kaiser family is similarly indebted but Edgar F. Kaiser appears in the Republican column with $1,000.

With the bulk of the big money on the other side, it is surprising that the Democrats manage as well as they do. The report showed the Republicans had spent $7,750,000 by October 21 of this year and the Democrats, $3,887,428. The Republicans had cash on hand at that time of $3,678,000 while the Democrats had $1,091,000. The new power of labor tends somewhat to lessen the imbalance. The report showed that of $1,500,000 spent by labor groups this year, "virtually all" went to help the Democrats. To frighten labor off, a test case against the United Automobile Workers under Section 610 of the Corrupt Practices Act has been brought by the Department of Justice and is now pending before the Supreme Court. "There has never," the report notes, "been an indictment of a corporation under this section." The big money would like to see labor's funds barred from politics.

Political Contributions From The World of Journalism

To the Republicans: Gardner Cowles (Look), $2500; Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Field, Jr. (Chicago Sun), $5500 (and $500 to the Democrats); Henry R. Luce (Life), $12,500 (and Clare Luce, $1500; Eugene Meyer (Washington Post), $500; William S. Paley (CBS), $12,000; Whitelaw Reid (New York Herald-Tribune), $500; M. Robert Rogers (WGMS), $2,000; De Witt Wallace (Reader's Digest), $4500.

To the Democrats: Barry Bingham (Louisville Courier Journal), $3,000; Gilbert A. Harrison (New Republic), $3,000; Mrs. Walter Lippmann ($1,000); Gifford Phillips (California Frontier), $500; Michael Straight (New Republic), $500.

To Americans for Democratic Action: Dorothy Schiff (New York Post), $3,000.

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Field (one time backer of the newspaper PM) gave $14,000 to the Democrats, $2,000 to Americans for Democratic Action, and $1,000 to the National Committee for An Effective Congress.

*** The subcommittee heard testimony from its political science consultant, Dr. Alexander Heard, that the campaign of 1952 actually cost $140,000,000, of which 60 percent was spent by the Republicans and 40 percent by the Democrats. This year's real expenditures are expected to be somewhat less but still of that magnitude.**

Names Make News: Here Are The Handful of Liberals Among Contributors

Among the contributors of $500 or more to Democratic organizations who may be of interest to New Dealers and liberal readers were: Frank Altschul, $1,000; Thurman Arnold, $1,500; George W. Ball, $1,000; Wm. Benton, $5,500; Joseph Borkin, $1,000; Arde Bulova, $6,000 Mr. and Mrs. Will Clayton, $9,900; Thomas G. Corcoran, $2,900; Richardson Dilworth, $500; Albert M. Greenfield, $1,000; W. Averell Harriman, $1,000; David Lloyd Kreeger, $1,000; Mr. and Mrs. Ferdinand Kuhn, $1,000; Herbert Lehman, $4,000; David E. Lilienthal, $1,500; Eleanor Lowenthal (Mrs. Max L.) $4,500; Dr. Isadore Lubin, $500; Leo J. Margolin, $1,000; Herbert S. Marks, $1,250; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., $2,000; Paul H. Nitze, $3,000; Louis Nizer, $1,000; Edwin W. Pauley, $4,000; Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Pomerance, $3,500; Mr. and Mrs. George D. Pratt, Jr., $12,000; Dr. Louise L. Rauh, $500; Edward J. Steichen, $500; Philip M. Stern, $3,500; Dewey D. Stone, $8,000; Mr. and Mrs. Michael W. Straus, $1,000; Max Swiren, $500.

Chief ADA Contributors

Americans for Democratic Action listed $23,063 in receipts of $500 or more from the following individuals: Saul Brodsky, Croton on Hudson, $500; Albert S. Coolidge, Belmont, Mass., $1,000; Marshall Field, $2,000; Louis Grodsky, Croton on Hudson, $500; Adriel Harris, Croton on Hudson, $500; Jane Harris, NY, $500;Mrs. Jack Kaplan, NY, $500; Mrs. David M. Levy, NY, $4,500; Louis Lubin, Peekskill, $500; Robert R. Nathan, Wash., D. C., $3,500; George D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgewater, Conn., $1,000; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Wash.,

(*Continued on Page Three*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Israel Hesitates and Why Russia Clamped Down in Panic on Hungary

Some Clues to the News in The Middle East and Eastern Europe

Israel: It already had a quarter million Arabs. Occupation of the Gaza strip gave it another quarter million. If war comes with Jordan, Syria and Iraq, Israel will extend its frontiers to the Jordan river, thus taking in all of what was Palestine. But in so doing it will acquire another half million Arabs. This would give a State with about 1,600,000 Jews, a huge minority of 1,000,000 Arabs. Under such circumstances, a bi-national State, using both Hebrew and Arabic as its official languages (as Canada uses English and French) would become a political necessity. But the successful operation of a bi-national Palestine would require a change of attitude on the part of both peoples which it would be utopian to expect. This is the political dilemma which holds Israel back.

The notion of a solid Arab bloc ready for jehad, or holy war: When the chips were down, dynastic ambition and oil profits counted for more with the Arabs than the plight of Egypt. Iraq moved into Jordan to counter Egypt, not Israel. Saudi Arabia is fearful of seeing Ibn Saud's rivals, the Hashemite family, unite Iraq and Jordan. That movement of Saudi troops into Jordan was not a movement against Israel. The Jordanian-Saudi border has never been demarcated and Saudi Arabia is anxious to push it as far west as possible before Iraq takes over.

The Revolt Against Stalinism: In Hungary the revolt against Stalinism reached a third and climactic phase. The first phase was Titoism; this is a form of national communism which differs from Stalinism only in a milder attitude toward its heretics. In Yugoslavia, as in Russia, there is no sign of free discussion; indeed the "cult of personality" still survives in Belgrade after its destruction in Moscow. The Polish revolt is not Titoism but a second stage in the reaction against Stalinism. This stage is no longer purely national. In Poland there is vigorously free discussion in the press; free debate in Parliament; movement toward restoration of parliamentary rule rather than government by decree; and a reinvigoration of the surviving non-Communist parties, though still within the framework of Communist predominance and a one-slate electoral system. The Hungarian revolt went into a third stage, with the demand for free elections.

Hungary: The last free elections in Hungary, in November 1945, gave the Communists less than 17 percent of the vote. The Social Democrats got slightly more. Together they polled about 35 percent, compared to the right-of-center Smallholders Party, which polled over 57 percent. The chances were that the Marxist Left—even with a "national", "Titoist" and "liberalized" Communist wing—would poll less than that now in a free election. Socialism's good name has been blackened by Communism's rigid and arbitrary rule. The Right would have won at the polls. The demand for free elections was thus the prelude, in Russian eyes, to an anti-Russian and anti-Communist regime. A free Hungary threatened to be a hostile bridgehead in the East, the cornerstone of a new *cordon sanitaire.*

Poland: There is a crucial difference between nationalism in Poland and nationalism in Hungary. The former stands to gain by maintenance of the status quo. The Poles are concerned above all else with retaining the territories taken from Germany; their hope of rebuilding a prosperous industrial country depends on holding the Oder-Neisse lands. For this they require a Russian understanding against Germany; to become again a power hostile to Russia would be to invite a new Russo-German partition. Stalin was never shrewder than when he gave Poland the Oder-Neisse territory and thus made it dependent on Russia. But Hungary, an enemy country, lost by the last war. For her, recovery of "the lands of the crown of St. Stephen", the inevitable goal of a renascent nationalist Hungary, means the recovery of Transylvania from Rumania and of Croatia from Yugoslavia. This would make her the natural spearhead of a new anti-Russian crusade. Tito as a Yugoslav is as much opposed by national interest to the reappearance of that kind of a Hungary as is Moscow. This explains Belgrade's cold attitude toward the Hungarian uprising.

Footnote to the Testing Dispute

Senator Clinton P. Anderson, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, in Nevada to campaign for Alan Bible, told newspapermen there (Las Vegas Sun, Oct. 30), "We have more super bombs than we know what to do with and we have developed bombs so big we don't dare test them."

(*Continued from Page Two*)

D. C., $563; Dr. Louise W. Rauh, Cincinnati, Ohio, $500; Marvin Rosenberg, N. Y., $1,000; Mrs. Dorothy Schiff (*New York Post*), $3,000; Morton Wolovsky, NY, $500; Reginald H. Zalles, Bethesda, Md., $1,000.

The National Committee for An Effective Congress listed $17,000 in contributions of $500 or more from the following: Laird Bell, Chicago, $500; Marshall Field, $1,000; Charles Gutwirth, NY, $500; Susan M. Lee, NY, $1,000; Isadore Lipschutz, $1,000; Yoland D. Markson, Los Angeles, $1,000; Mayer Family, NY, $3,000; George D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgewater, Conn., $4,000; Charles Rose, NY, $500 Herbert M. Rothschild NY, $500; Richard Salomon, NY, $500; Sidney H. Scheuer, NY, $1,500; Joseph D. Shane, Beverly Hills, Cal., $1,000; John Stahl, Los Angeles, $500; Ben Zukor, Beverly Hills, $500.

The *AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education* lists only one contribution over $500: Max Lowenthal, New Milford, Conn., $4,000. *Railway Labor's Political League* also lists Max Lowenthal as its only contributor in the $500 or over bracket. He gave $5,000.

Cardinal Mindszenty — A Brave Man But A Political Anachronism

"A brave and obstinate man, a narrow Hungarian nationalist, and a conservative with little understanding for social issues, Mindszenty was an almost medieval figure, a prelate from the heroic times of the Turkish invasions. He antagonized not only the Communists but the large number of Hungarian democrats who . . . in any case wished as strongly as the communists themselves to transform the semi-feudal and chauvinist Hungary which the Cardinal seemed to defend."

—*Hugh Seton-Watson: The East European Revolution (1950).*

"In looking back, there is little doubt that his uncompromising stand and outspoken sympathies for a vanished political order would have embarrassed many a conservative Government; would have driven most liberal Administrations into a Kulturkampf against him. . . ."

—*Gordon Shepherd: Russia's Danubian Empire (1954).*

"Mindszenty and the government came to preliminary fierce clash on two paramount issues. First, the land reform. Second, nationalization of the schools. The Church was a very important landowner in Hungary; it was the biggest in fact, owning about 900,000 acres. . . . Mindszenty himself was implacably opposed to the land reform."

—*John Gunther: Behind The Iron Curtain (1949).*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Humanity Seems to Be Celebrating International Hypocrisy Week at The United Nations

The Terrible Truth About The World Crisis (And Me)

The terrible observation in the world crisis is that nations, peoples, and individuals take the law into their own hands when they feel that their really vital interests are at stake. To listen to the debates at the UN, one could well believe that humanity was celebrating international hypocrisy week. One of the great discoveries in industry was that of interchangeable parts. Listening to the oratory, one could speak of interchangeable moral phrases. What the Russians said in condemnation of the British in Egypt was exactly what the British said in condemnation of the Russians in Hungary. Russia thought the conditions Britain and France attached to their acceptance of the cease fire "incompatible with the national sovereignty of Egypt." Insert the word "Hungary," and you see what we mean.

The Mote In Mine Own Eye

Since every man is a microcosm, in whose heart may be read all that sends armies marching, I must admit I am no better. Because so many bonds attach me to Israel, I am ready to condone preventive war; I rejoiced when my side won. Though I preach international understanding and support for the UN, I found all the excuses for Israel that warring nationalisms always find to excuse breaches of the peace. Should they wait until the enemy is strong enough to attack them? Is it not mere prudence to anticipate the blow? What better time to save Israel than in concert with Britain and France, on the eve of the American election, and before the winter rains made the Negev and Sinai impassible for tanks? Israel's survival seemed worth the risk to world peace. And this is how it always is and how it starts, and I offer up the mote in my own eye.

The Russians and the Egyptians say Israel was the aggressor, and so it was. But what were all those Migs for, which Moscow poured into Egypt in exchange for its precious cotton? What was Nasser doing when he boasted that he would soon exterminate Israel? . . . And from the Arab side I can hear the recriminations about the homeless refugees it was their sacred duty to revenge and put back into repossession. The quarrels of nations are as difficult to unravel as those of children, but the pistols are no longer toy.

If only we were all saints like the Indians, breathed deeply, and meditated on the infinite wisdom of certain sacred syllables. . . . We are grateful for Nehru. But the old Adam lives in him, too. He is a Kashmiri. Kashmir's high lovely vales are home to him. Nehru, like the rest of us, finds abnegation easiest at a distance. He can be altruistic about Sinai and Budapest. But when Kashmir is at stake? Nehru has just arranged for a puppet "constituent Assembly" (dissident members in jail) to declare Kashmir part of India, though Nehru himself once promised that he would abide by a plebiscite's decision between India and Pakistan. In Kashmir a Hindu minority has long ruled a Muslim majority and a plebiscite would mean that Nehru might rule an India with its most beloved portion, his home, torn from it. . . . So are we all.

Sic Semper (The Other Fellow's) Tyrants

What the Russians are doing in Budapest is so dreadful that even the Indian, Icelandit and American Communist parties protest. Moscow is ready to do anything in order to keep in its "zone of security" governments politically satisfactory to it. But haven't we just finished a campaign in which the Republicans boasted of the quick way we toppled the Arbenz government in Guatemala? Moscow doesn't want anti-Russian and anti-Communist governments in Eastern Europe. We in the Caracas agreement tried to ensure that no anti-American and anti-capitalist governments could be formed in our hemisphere. How we honor brave fighters for freedom . . . until they shoot down *our* tyrant friends, as recently in Nicaragua.

The fact that H-bombs now exist and that a new war may ruin the earth . . . this is forgotten when vital interests are touched, when it seems a matter of life and death for one's own. . . . This is the fatal phrase "one's own." Perhaps it will take a new menace from outside the planet to make men feel at last that all who inhabit it are their own. . . . But beware of these fine phrases. I, too, like the rest of them (and maybe even you), am a hypocrite.

Advt. (Not So Cosmic): That Friend Who Always Borrows The Weekly — Why Not Get Him to Subscribe?

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

11/12/56

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED